

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-27, 29-33, and 35- 48 have been amended. Claims 1-48 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

Claims 1-11, 14-24, 27-33 and 36-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bass et al. (U.S. Patent 6,549,956) (hereinafter “Bass”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In regard to claim 1, Bass does not anticipate at least the features of, “receiving, by an event message endpoint on a client platform in the distributed computing environment, indications from one or more client processes registering interest in receiving one or more of a plurality of events generated by a service in the distributed computing environment; [and] the event message endpoint automatically subscribing to the one or more events with the service in response to said indications registering interest in the one or more events received from the one or more client processes,” as recited in amended claim 1.

At col. 4, lines 57-59, Bass states (emphasis added) “prior to transfer of events between the domains, the respective process and channel adapters of the domains must be configured to send and receive the different events.” The paragraph at col. 4, line 59 - col. 5 line 10 goes on to describe “the mechanism for configuring the adapters” (emphasis added):

The configuration begins when an adapter signals the administrator that it has a new event to publish to interested processes. For example, assume process adapter 1 19 of domain 2 13 is publishing the new event. The administrator would configure the broker 17 to list channel adapter 15 as a subscriber to the event. Thus, adapter 15 would receive the event from the process, when the process adapter publishes the event. The administrator, via configuration interface 29, would configure the channel adapter to

send the event over the Internet to channel adapter 14 of domain 1. The channel adapter 15 would signal the channel adapter 14 that a new event is going to be received by channel adapter 14, and sends the updated export list to the other channel adapter. The channel adapter of domain 2 becomes capable of exporting the event. The administrator of domain 1 would configure the channel adapter 14 to publish the event to interested process adapter in domain 1.

From the above, it is clear that Bass' system requires an administrator in each domain, via a configuration interface of the respective domain, to configure brokers and channel adapters to subscribe to and/or publish events. Particularly note that, in Bass' system, the administrator of a domain must configure the channel adapter in the domain to publish an event to interested process adapters in the domain (col. 5, lines 7-9). In contrast to Bass' system, in which administrators must manually configure both brokers and channel adapters via a configuration interface to publish and/or subscribe to events, amended claim 1 recites an event message endpoint automatically subscribing to one or more events with a service in response to indications registering interest in the one or more events received from one or more client processes. Bass clearly does not anticipate at least these features of amended claim 1.

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Arguments similar to those presented above regarding claim 1 apply equally to claims 14 and 36.

In regard to claim 2, Bass does not anticipate at least the features of, “obtaining a markup language schema on the client platform, wherein said markup language schema defines a message interface for the plurality of events generated by the service; and automatically constructing the event message endpoint for the client platform according to the markup language schema, wherein said constructing is performed within a runtime environment of the client platform,” as recited in amended claim 2.

The Office has cited Bass, col. 3 lines 43-50, col. 4 line 43 – col. 5 line 15, and col. 2 lines 4-15, and has contended that Bass teaches “that each channel adapter is initialized with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain and they handshake with sets of events even though they are in a completely different domain.” However, Bass’ channel adapters clearly exist prior to being “initialized with a set of events” to export. Initializing an existing channel adapter according to a set of events to be exported from the domain of the channel adapter to other domains is clearly not the same as constructing an event message endpoint for a client platform according to a received markup language schema that defines a message interface for a plurality of events generated by a service.

Furthermore, as noted above in regards to claim 1, Bass’ system requires an administrator in each domain, via a configuration interface of the respective domain, to configure brokers and channel adapters to subscribe to and/or publish events (*see, e.g.*, col. 4, line 57 - col. 5 line 10). Particularly note that, in Bass’ system, the administrator must manually configure a broker to list a channel adapter as a subscriber to an event being published by a process adapter (col. 4, lines 63-66), and the administrator of a domain must configure the channel adapter in the domain to publish an event to interested process adapters in the domain (col. 5, lines 7-9). In contrast to Bass’ system, in which an administrator configures brokers and channel adapters via a configuration interface, claim 2 recites that the event message endpoint for the client platform is automatically constructed according to the markup language schema.

Bass clearly does not anticipate at least these features of amended claim 2.

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claim 2 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Arguments similar to those presented above regarding claim 1 apply equally to claims 15 and 37.

In regard to claim 27, Bass does not anticipate at least the features of, program instructions executable by a processor to implement a service process

configured to: “generate a message in a markup language, wherein the message includes a markup language representation of the event generated by the service process; and send the message to one or more event message gate units in a distributed computing environment that have each automatically subscribed to the event with the service process in response to one or more client processes registering interest in the event with the respective event message gate unit,” as recited in amended claim 27.

As noted above in reference to claim 1, it is clear that Bass’ system requires an administrator in each domain, via a configuration interface of the respective domain, to configure brokers and channel adapters to subscribe to and/or publish events (*see, e.g.*, col. 4, line 57 - col. 5 line 10). Particularly note that, in Bass’ system, the administrator must manually configure a broker to list a channel adapter as a subscriber to an event being published by a process adapter (col. 4, lines 63-66). In contrast to Bass’ system, in which administrators must manually configure both brokers and channel adapters via a configuration interface to publish and/or subscribe to events, amended claim 27 recites a service process configured to send a message including a markup language representation of an event generated by the service process to one or more event message gate units in a distributed computing environment that have each automatically subscribed to the event with the service process in response to one or more client processes registering interest in the event with the respective event message gate unit. Bass clearly does not anticipate at least these features of amended claim 27.

For at least the reasons given above, the rejection of claim 27 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

Claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 34, 35, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Bass in view of Meltzer et al. (U.S. Patent 6,542,912) (hereinafter

“Meltzer”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons given above regarding their respective independent claims.

In regard to both the section 102 and 103 rejections, Applicants also assert that the rejections of numerous ones of the dependent claims are further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-65700/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: April 26, 2010